

REMARKS

Claims 1, 11, 13, 14, 28 and 34 are amended. Claims 36-48 are canceled. Claims 1-35 are in the application for consideration.

Independent claim 1 stands rejected as being anticipated by Japanese reference JP 60-226123 and U.S. Patent No. 4,320,191 to Yoshikawa et al., independent claim 28 stands rejected as being anticipated by Yoshikawa et al., and independent claim 13 stands rejected as being obvious over Yoshikawa et al. Each of independent claim 1, 13 and 28 has been amended to recite that the photoresist is different from the antireflective coating, and that the antireflective coating has a total thickness which is less than that of the photoresist. Different composition photoresist and antireflective coating is inherently contemplated in the application as-filed, for example in disclosing the selective etch/removal in the processing from Fig. 4 to Fig. 5, and in the subsequent separate removal of the antireflective coating in the processing in going from Fig. 5 to Fig. 6. Further, Applicant's application as-filed inherently shows in the drawings the antireflective coating having a total thickness which is less than that of the photoresist. Accordingly, no new matter is added. Such is neither shown nor suggested by the Japanese '123 or Yoshikawa et al. references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Specifically, the Yoshikawa et al. reference clearly only discloses utilizing a composite of a silver layer over a selenium selenide layer as a photoresist itself. (see col.2, Ins.3-9). Accordingly, the reference in no way

discloses or suggests using a germanium and selenium comprising material as an antireflective coating. Further, as the Yoshikawa et al. reference only discloses utilizing a silver and a Ge/Se composite as photoresist, the reference in no way discloses or suggests utilizing a different and additional material as photoresist with an antireflective coating. Further, it is even more inconceivable that the reference could suggest relative thicknesses between an antireflective coating and a different photoresist, as the reference discloses only one and not the other.

Regarding the Japanese '123 reference, such does not disclose utilizing an antireflective coating comprising Ge and Se having a total thickness which is less than that of the photoresist. Japanese '123 is clearly not utilizing its Ge/Se layer as an antireflective coating, but rather as part of a mask used to pattern photoresist layer 8.

Neither of the applied references discloses or suggests that which Applicant recites in independent claims 1, 13 and 28, namely as a minimum utilizing Ge and Se as a thinner antireflective coating underneath a photoresist layer. Therefore, the cited references do not anticipate or render obvious Applicant's amended independent claims 1, 13, and 28. Accordingly, the rejections thereof should be withdrawn, and claims 1, 13 and 28 should be allowed. Action to that end is requested.

Applicant's dependent claims should be allowed as depending from allowable base claims, and for their own recited features which are neither shown nor suggested in the cited art. For example, and by way of example

only, amended dependent claims 11, 14 and 34 recite solvent processing the photoresist followed by dry etching all of the antireflective coating exposed through the photoresist openings. According to the English translation of the abstract of the Japanese '123 reference, Japanese '123 teaches wet solvent processing to produce its mask 4, followed by further wet processing to produce its Fig. 1c and 3c. Yoshikawa et al. does not disclose any germanium/selenium antireflective coating used with a different photoresist, and accordingly, in no way could suggest the claimed wet then dry processing. Further, the processing depicted by Yoshikawa et al. in going from Figs. 3 to 4 is wet, and in going from Figs. 4 to 5 is wet. Further, the processing going from Fig. 12 to Fig. 13 is dry, but such is not removing all of the antireflective coating exposed through the photoresist openings. Even were the composite layers 2 and 3 of Yoshikawa et al. to somehow be considered as Applicant's claim recited antireflective coating, all is not etched by the dry etching, as portion 3 is wet etched in going between Figs. 11 and 12. Accordingly, amended dependent claims 11, 14 and 34 should be allowed for these additional reasons.

An earnest attempt has been made to place this application in immediate condition for allowance. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview prior to issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11-21-03

By 
Mark S. Matkin
Reg. No. 32,268